

1 RICHMOND ESSEX, L.P.,
2 Plaintiff,
3
4 v.
5 KENNETH B. SHERMAN, et al.,
6 Defendants.

7
8
9
10
11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 Case No. 16-cv-05200-KAW

13
14 **AMENDED REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO REMAND
ACTION TO STATE COURT; ORDER
REASSIGNING CASE**

15 Re: Dkt. Nos. 1, 2, 3

16 On September 9, 2016, Defendants Kenneth B. Sherman and Kathy A. Sherman, acting
17 pro se, removed this unlawful detainer action from Contra Costa Superior Court.

18 As removal is obviously improper, the undersigned also recommends that the case be
19 REMANDED to state court. Furthermore, as neither party has consented to magistrate judge
20 jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), this case should be REASSIGNED to a district judge.

21
22 **I. BACKGROUND**

23 Plaintiff commenced this unlawful detainer action in Contra Costa County Superior Court
24 on July 22, 2016. (Dkt. No. 1.) The case is a "limited civil case," as the amount demanded is less
25 than \$10,000. (*Id.*) Plaintiff seeks possession of certain property located in Richmond, California,
26 which Defendants currently occupy. (*See id.*) On September 9, 2016, Defendants removed the
27 action to this Court, claiming that the case presents a federal question. (Dkt. No. 1.)

28
29 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

30 "Except as otherwise expressly provided by Act of Congress, any civil action brought in a
31 State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be
32 removed by the defendant . . . to the district court . . . for the district and division embracing the
33 place where such action is pending." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). A party seeking to remove an action to
34 federal court bears the burden of establishing that removal is proper. *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d

1 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (per curiam). "Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt
2 as to the right of removal in the first instance." *Id.* (citation omitted).

3 Federal district courts have original jurisdiction over actions that present a federal question
4 or those based on diversity jurisdiction. *See Wayne v. DHL Worldwide Express*, 294 F.3d 1179,
5 1183 & n.2 (9th Cir. 2002). Federal district courts have federal question jurisdiction over "all civil
6 actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
7 Federal question jurisdiction is governed by the well-pleaded complaint rule, which provides that
8 the basis for federal jurisdiction must appear on the face of the properly pleaded complaint, either
9 because the complaint directly raises an issue of federal law or because the plaintiff's "right to
10 relief under state law requires resolution of a substantial question of federal law in dispute
11 between the parties." *Franchise Tax Bd. of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Trust for S. Cal.*,
12 463 U.S. 1, 13 (1983). "[A] case may not be removed to federal court on the basis of a federal
13 defense . . . , even if the defense is anticipated in the plaintiff's complaint . . ." *Caterpillar Inc. v.*
14 *Williams*, 482 U.S. 386, 393 (1987) (citation omitted).

15 III. DISCUSSION

16 Defendants have failed to establish that federal question jurisdiction exists over this action.
17 The state court action is an unlawful detainer case. (*See* Dkt. No. 1.) This does not present a
18 federal question. *See Litton Loan Servicing, L.P. v. Villegas*, No. 10-5478 (PJH), 2011 WL
19 204322, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2011). Defendants' assertion that a federal question exists
20 because their answer is "a pleading depend [sic] on the determination of Defendant's [sic] rights
21 and Plaintiff's duties under federal law" does not alter this analysis. The well-pleaded complaint
22 rule prevents the Court from considering any such claims. *See Provincial Gov't of Marinduque v.*
23 *Placer Dome, Inc.*, 582 F.3d 1083, 1086 (9th Cir. 2009).

24 Accordingly, because Defendants attempt to invoke this Court's jurisdiction based on a
25 federal question, and because this action presents no such federal question, the Court finds that
26 subject matter jurisdiction does not exist in this case.

27 IV. CONCLUSION

28 For the reasons set forth above, the undersigned recommends that this case be

1 REMANDED to state court for lack of subject matter.

2 Any party may file objections to this report and recommendation with the district judge
3 within 14 days of being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b);
4 N.D. Civil L.R. 72-2. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified
5 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. *IBEW Local 595 Trust Funds v. ACS*
6 *Controls Corp.*, No. C-10-5568 EDL, 2011 WL 1496056, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2011).

7 IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

8
9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: September 21, 2016

12 
KANDIS A. WESTMORE
13 United States Magistrate Judge

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California